



[10191/538]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Marko MASCHKE et al.

Serial No. : 08/963,720

Filed : November 4, 1997

For : PROCESS FOR GENERATING COLLISION SIGNALS

Examiner : Jacques H. Louis-Jacques

Art Unit : 3661

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
and addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington,
D.C. 20231, on

Dated: 1/24/00

Reg. 41,172

Signature

**DERVIS MAGISTRE
KENYON & KENYON****RESPONSE AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

SIR:

In response to the Final Office Action dated October 22, 1999, reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain pending in this application and are submitted for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 4-6 include allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In pointing out the supposed deficiencies of this claim, the Examiner makes two points. First, the Examiner asserts that "it is not clear whether the 'simulated signal segments' are being combined or whether they become inputs to the overall transmission function." Next, the Examiner asserts that the "step of 'simulating...' becomes 'useless' since the result of the simulating step does not affect the steps of 'combining' and 'forming'." Office Action at page 3. In responding to this rejection, Applicants emphasized that when read in light of the specification, the claim language noted in the Examiner's rejection would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Although the Examiner acknowledges that the clarity of claims are indeed to be examined in light of the